ORIGINAL



GLIEGE LAW OFFICES, PLLC P.O. Box 1388 RECEIVED Flagstaff, AZ 86002-1388 (928) 226-8333 2007 JUL 23 A 9:07 3 John G. Gliege (#003644) AZ CORP COMMISSIUM Stephanie J. Gliege (#022465) DOCKET CONTROL Attorneys for the Complainants 5 BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 6 7 RAYMOND R. PUGEL AND JULIE B. DOCKET NO. W-03512A-06-0407 PUGEL, husband and wife as trustees of THE 8 RAYMOND R. PUGEL and JULIE B. PUGEL Rejoinder Testimony of Ray Pugel 9 FAMILY TRUST, 10 and ROBERT RANDALL and SALLY RANDALL, 11 husband and wife Complainants, 12 13 PINE WATER COMPANY, an Arizona Corporation W-03512A-07-0019 14 Respondent.. 15 16 17 18 ASSET TRUST MANAGEMENT, CORP. **DOCKET NO.W-03512A-06-0613** Complainants, 19 PINE WATER COMPANY, an Arizona 20 Corporation 21 Respondent. 22 23 JAMES HILL and SIOUX HILL, husband and wife and as trustees of THE HILL FAMILY 24 035i2. DOCKET NO. W-20511A-07-0100 TRUST, 25 Complainants, 26 PINE WATER COMPANY, an Arizona 27 Corporation Respondent. 28 29

3205

Did you read the Surrebuttal Testimony filed by Pine Water Company and the Testimony filed by the Arizona Corporation Commission Staff? YES

Before addressing specific issues do you have any general comments regarding the Pine Water Company Surrebuttal Testimony?

Pine Water Company has raised a number of new issues in its attempt to obfuscate the fact that it cannot provide adequate water service to the Complainants. They have brought in testimony regarding Mr. Peterson and Mr. Fumusa. In the five day turn around time from the receipt of the testimony until the filing, it is not possible to obtain surrebuttal testimony from Mr. Peterson and Mr. Fumusa, so they will be called as witnesses. Copies of any exhibits about which they intend to testify will be disclosed upon receipt of the same.

Pine Water Company has chosen in its Surrebuttal Testimony to take the focus of this matter off

the fact that they are unable to provide adequate water service to the Complainants' property and

have chosen to write, almost from a victim perspective, their story of how they have tried and

swayed by this approach and instead should look at the simple facts. We need water, they can't

failed to provide adequate water service in the community. The Commission should not be

deliver it. They have not been able to provide adequate water service for over 11 years and have held our community hostage. We have water, and we should be allowed to serve ourselves. We should not be forced to join an inferior system, which provides inferior service to its customers. We should not be forced by the government to give up what our risk capital provided so that a water company may profit it from it when in 11 years they have failed to live up to the responsibilities dictated by their CC&N. I do not believe that the intent or the spirit of granting a CC&N is to protect the monopoly of a provider who has deficient service and has failed to improve it in 11 years. You cannot find water if you do not look for it.

Before addressing specific issues do you have any general comments regarding the Staff Testimony?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

28

29

In his testimony on page 11 lines 13 through 17 Mr. Hardcastle points out that the only thing you have done to share water with the Community is to tell the Fire Department that it was available in case of an emergency. Is there anything else that you can do?

Because of the existence of Pine Water Company's CC&N we cannot sell water or otherwise provide it in the community, so Mr. Hardcastle's criticism is poorly addressed. Mr. Hardcastle has the ability to acquire the water from us and to provide it to the community and he has refused to do that.

On page 20 lines 14-15 Mr. Hardcastle indicates that "there are a number of possibilities, none of which can be explored without his willingness to start the process." Do you believe that Pine Water Company is interested in exploring possibilities with you?

Based upon their prior conduct and demeanor, it appears that Pine Water Company is only willing to explore possibilities with me if I am willing to do it their way. They speak of Advances in Aid of Construction, but without specifics as to the term and the return and as to whether or not I would be 100% compensated for what is given to them.

Regarding Water Supply, they are willing to compensate me for the water lines which may be installed by virtue of an Aid in Advance of Construction, and for a portion of the well which would serve the development of my property. They also speak of possibly buying the well to provide for other customers of Pine Water Company, but they only want to purchase the infrastructure; they make no provision for purchasing the water which also has value. It seems odd that they can purchase the infrastructure and use it to pump out the water which they sell to others and the people who developed the well get no benefit out of that water sale. While it is used as a measure to determine the amount of infrastructure payment, no compensation is being offered by Pine Water Company or recommended by Staff for the water which would be extracted from the well.

The State Constitution provides that private property shall not be taken for public use without compensation being paid to the owner of that private property. The machinations of Mr. Hardcastle, which sadly are being supported by the Staff, will create a situation where the private property, the well and infrastructure, could be partially taken if the payback on the line extension

agreement is insufficient to cover the value of that property, and the right to the water would be totally taken without compensation to the Complainants.

Do you have anything that you would like to add to this testimony?

Only that this is a very frustrating process. Pine Water Company cannot provide adequate service. We have water, a well and can provide service, but they are not willing to purchase the water, rather just the infrastructure and take as much water as they want. Water has value. If Pine Water Company wants our water so they can sell it to someone else, whether it be a customer who is within the community or on our property, they should pay for the water, or find another source of water to use. The citizens of Pine, along with ourselves the Complainants have put up with many years of poor and inadequate service. There is a solution at hand, however since it is not Pine Water Company's solution it is not considered a viable one.

Does that conclude your testimony? YES

1	Original and 17 copies mailed/delivered This 14 th day of May, 2007 to:
2	1 mis 14 day of May, 2007 to:
3	Arizona Corporation Commission Attn: Docket Control
4	1200 W. Washington Phoenix, AZ 85007
5	Copies of the foregoing mailed/delivered
6	This 14 th day of May, 2007 to:
7	Kevin O. Torrey Attorney, Legal Division
8	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 W. Washington Street
9	Phoenix, AZ 85007
10	ktorrey@azcc.gov
11	Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel Legal Division
12	Arizona Corporation Commission
	1200 W. Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007
13	Firest C. Johnson Director
14	Ernest G. Johnson, Director Utilities Division
15	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 W. Washington Street
16	Phoenix, AZ 85007
17	Jay L. Shapiro
18	Fennemore Craig 3003 North Central Ave. Ste 2600
	Phoenix, AZ 85012-2913
19	JSHAPIRO@fclaw.com
20	David W. Davis, ESQ.
21	Turley, Swan & Childers, P.C. 3101 N. Central, Suite 1300
22	Phoenix, AZ 85012-2643 ddavis@tsc-law.com
23	Robert M. Cassaro
24	PO Box 1522 Pine, AZ 85544
25	William F. Haney
26	3018 E. Mallory St.
27	Mesa, AZ 85213
•	Barbara Hall
28	PO Box 2198 Pine, AZ 85544